

CANDOUR

*The British
Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLII No 10

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

October 1990

IMMIGRATION - A POLICY GOING WRONG?

by ANTHONY COONEY

UNTIL very recently the Whig-secularist Ascendancy, whether in the political establishment, the "quality" press, the "meeja", the higher echelons of the civil service or Academia (Oxbridge, Redbrick and Concrete) had every reason to be complacent. They had developed to a fine art the technique of blandly ignoring periodic swells of public opinion against immigration and, for that matter, crime and punishment, educational standards and methods, abolition of real counties, metrication and a dozen other things imposed upon the Nation against the Nation's will. They were confident that such swells could be dissipated, crashing uselessly against the stone wall of the Ascendancy's determination to impose its policy. Those few who refused to disperse were easily isolated, denied expression, rendered powerless and smeared as "racists".

The "Salmon Rushdie affair" exploded on them like a sudden fork of lightning splitting the sunlit sky of the high noon of their triumph. Here was one of their own, exercising the Humanist prerogative of remaining to scoff without ever having gone into the desert to pray, but instead of the scoffed at sending their bishops to the T.V. studios to smile blandly and lay down alongside the doormat, a howl of fury rent the air. And not merely a howl, but a demand! The offending book must be banned. The Ascendancy may not have been too ruffled at first. "Stand firm, ignore these ignorant bigots and they'll go away. By next week they will realise how powerless they are against us. We have the press, we have the publishing houses, we have the airwaves - what can they do?"

The Biter Bit

But then came the sentence of death, the demonstrations, the hundreds of volunteers to carry it out and one or two specimen bookshop firings to drive the point home. "My Bertrand," must have been the thought. "What have we done? We planted these millions here to give the coup de grace to Christian culture and the law and custom which rested upon it, and now they turn out to be a greater threat to the sunlit pastures of free-thought, free-love and free-perversion, rid forever of patriotism, nationalism and morality, than that which we waged our secret war against for decades." Of course there was a half-hearted attempt to deploy the old tricks, but letters with fifty signatures to **The Guardian** are a very unconvincing shield against a bullet.

If the Academia Brigade of the "One World-One Race" army were feeling dismay, the turn of the Politicians' Platoon in that outfit was soon to come. Important Muslim spokesmen (the British don't have any) were

soon to demand that "Islam" constitute a non-territorial State in Great Britain, but not subject to British Law. If this meant that its "subjects" could not vote, stand for office or sit on the bench, it might not be such a bad idea - but you can bet it won't mean that. However, as an aside, when G.K. Chesterton made the same suggestion with regard to the Jews after his visit to Palestine he was denounced as "anti-Semitic", though in the same utterance he had supported wholeheartedly the idea of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine of which all Jews everywhere would be citizens. By the same token, there are well-meaning liberalists prepared to fight to everyone else's death against "Apartheid", who are energetically demanding Apartheid for the Amazonian Indians.

Another nasty turn of the stomach was soon to visit the "United Politicians for Immigrant Privilege Party" (which has a majority of seats on both sides of the House). Before the first R.A.F. Squadron had taken wing for the Persian Gulf, the "British" Muslims were demanding that Great Britain "keep out". At the time of writing, only fearful guesses can be made by the Government as to how they will keep order at home if fighting starts.

A great temptation presents itself to the real British, and one suspects that it will fill the Ascendancy with glee if it is succumbed to. The temptation is to blame the immigrants. We may feel that their "community leaders" are scoundrels and impudent scoundrels at that, but we must not lose sight of the fact that the immigrants are victims; lured here, against the wishes of the British, for the economic, political and ideological purposes of an Ascendancy which, in truth, has held the "people of the soil" in contempt since 1066. (The personnel of the Ascendancy has changed many times, there is no hereditary connection, but the ethos and the institution has remained. If any one doubts that England has always been administered as a conquered country let them take a look at our land, game and forestry laws.)

Policy Point Of Origin

Was immigration a policy or just an accident? There are two aspects of the matter which cannot be explained except as manifestations of a policy. The first is the fixed determination not to legislate effectively against it, whatever popular pressure might be applied, and the reverse of that is that if immigration had been merely an unplanned economic trend it would have been legislated against as soon as it began to get out of hand. However, the matter is not one of conjecture, for it happens that the originating statement of the policy is available in **Hansard**.

"Let us remember that full employment is an economic experiment which is being tried for the first time in a free community. We have no past experience of that experiment, which I believe can work only if it is coupled with an immigration policy. Full employment means that people have a choice of jobs, and when they have that choice I cannot believe that there will ever be enough people who will choose the bottom jobs. There will always be a shortage of labour in the basic industries so long as there is full employment in a free economy, and that situation can only be overcome by a constant inflow from those nations where the standard of living is lower and where our bottom jobs appear to be jobs of luxury." [Mr R.T. Paget, Lab. Northampton, Debate on Displaced

Persons, 14 April 1947, in **From The Ground Up** by Jorian Jenks, Hollis and Carter, 1950.)

Paget was an articulate and intelligent member of the Labour Party. It is inconceivable that he could have made what amounted to a statement of policy in a Parliamentary Debate without the approval of the Government, even if he was not actually "put up" to make the statement during the debate. So there we have it - a policy of immigration from "those nations where the standard of living is lower" had been determined upon before 1948, ostensibly as a necessary concomitant to the Government's policy of "Full Employment" for which an irresistible popular demand had been manufactured by six years of wartime propaganda.

As a matter of fact, the Attlee Government had already made a sally into the field of immigration by announcing in 1947 a scheme to recruit coalminers in Italy. The N.U.M. immediately called a national strike in coal and the scheme was quickly dropped. We must not suppose the Government so short-sighted and obtuse as not to be able to judge the likely, and healthy, reaction of the coalminers. We must conclude that it was the reaction desired and judged to be obtainable. The speed with which the Government dropped the scheme supports this conclusion. But the miners had a bad press. Their entirely proper and natural desire to defend not only their jobs, but their communities and living space was easily represented as boorish greed, selfishness and insular bigotry. All of which made way for the more subtle "schemeless" arrival of the convoys preceded by the **Empire Windrush**.

The First Of Many, Many More

There were no strikes, no protests; after all, no one wanted to be bracketed with those horrible miners (always on strike for something and holding the country up to ransom). Besides, even if you could object to immigration from European countries, albeit with some ill-grace, in some subtle guilt-ridden way, objecting to "coloured" immigration was beyond the pale; something to be expected only from the low and the ignorant. Again, we must resist the temptation to blame the immigrants. Those who came first were victims. For the most part they looked upon England as the "Mother Country", were eager to work, were cheerful and naive, and were dismayed and hurt by the coldness of their reception. Open hostility to the first arrivals might have been more merciful as it would have stopped the flow; but in the carefully-created ethos of post-war Britain, open hostility was out. The British may be cads, but they are not bullies.

The end is not yet. Already we are being told that because of the "shortage of labour", engineered by subsidised contraception and abortion, we must, in ten years time, "import" more labour. Turkey and the Middle East have been suggested as sources; but then, when the suggestion was made no one really knew about Saddam Hussein, did they?

What is perhaps curious is the participation of the Churches in this policy. Are some of the bishops and leaders willing and conscious participants, or have they too been as skilfully manipulated as were the miners and the public in general? Probably most churchmen would say that one cannot oppose immigration and be a "true" Christian. G.K. Chesterton, the greatest apologist of Christianity in English history, touched upon the matter several times, and always in opposition.

In **The Flying Inn** it is the villain, Lord Ivywood, who supports the Turks when they import Chinese labour into the marble quarries of the Aegean. In **The New Freethinker** it is the odious John Grubby who "filled the mines with Chinamen." Most strongly it is in **The Man Who Knew Too Much** that Chesterton attacks immigration. The story hinges upon the fact that a corrupt and spineless government has allowed such large scale Asiatic immigration that when it threatens the structure of the state, their home countries feel entitled to make a military intervention. Is there anyone, even an Archbishop, who will, for these views, denounce Chesterton as "not a true Christian"?

If so, or even if not so, we must appeal to higher authority. Leo XIII in his definitive Encyclical on Christian Social Doctrine, called for a just social order, one of the benefits of which would be an end to emigration: "And a third advantage would spring from this; men would cling to the country in which they were born, for no one would exchange the land of his birth for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life."

If it can be said that that was written rather a long time ago, then let us consider the views of John XXIII in **Ad Petri Cathedram**: "We are deeply concerned also for those who are forced to leave their own country because they cannot find the means of a livelihood.... Who could count or measure the hardships and miseries they have to endure.... In consequence many succumb to the danger, and step by step depart from the sound religious ideals they have received from their fathers...."

Clearly emigration/immigration is not a Christian norm. Rather it is seen as something imposed by both economic conditions and policy, both of the sort to be deplored. Equally clearly the ideal Christian response should be to create the conditions in which people do not need to leave the land of their birth in the first place, or having been forced to do so might be able to return with confidence for the future.

Immigration into Great Britain has been the result of continuous policy. The signs are that it is about to rebound on the policy makers. If, in the end, Great Britain has restored to it a British Government, nothing should be given priority over the need for a thorough, public and judicial enquiry into the sources of that policy and the identity of those who articulated it.

THE B.B.C.'S UNFASHIONABLE "FASCISM"

THE B.B.C. is to drop the "flashing spear" logo which heralds its news programmes less than two years after it was introduced at a cost of £200,000. The reason? It has been criticised in certain over-sensitive quarters as resembling the "flash of action" symbol of Sir Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists. It will be replaced by the symbol of an upturned satellite dish, no doubt at a cost of another £200,000 for hard-pressed licence-payers to foot. After all, what is money? We wonder how many viewers really thought the flashing spear had fascist undertones? Probably not more than one per cent. Perhaps they can now sleep safe in the knowledge that the hated flash has been contained in a pan!

Open Letter to Members of Parliament

DON'T START A WAR OVER THE GULF CRISIS!

by DAVID HILL

I HAVE an interest to declare. Both my sons are of military age. If a war starts in the Near East, it could spread and intensify. Instead of a short war, it could be long. The Government may have to introduce conscription. My sons could lose an arm or a leg, be blinded, gassed or killed. Also, a relation of mine works for a Kuwaiti company. Fortunately, he and his family were in Europe when the Iraqis invaded. Recently they spent several days here and we had lengthy discussions about the Gulf situation.

A common misconception is that Saddam Hussein is bent on the conquest of the region. The south-west corner of Persia is peopled by Arabs. When the Persian revolution started, he tried to take the opportunity to take back this Arab territory into the Arab nation. In order to obtain an outlet to the sea, he claimed all the Shatt-el-Arab estuary. Likewise, his attack on Kuwait was aimed to secure an outlet to the sea. There is no evidence that he plans to attack other Arab countries.

The Pike And The Minnow

If you consult **The Times Atlas of World History**, you will see that ever since the dawn of history, nations have grown, matured and then disintegrated. Examples are the empires of Rome, Turkey, Britain and now Russia. Young nations grow at the expense of those which have become senile. It is ridiculous for the United Nations to contend that no state may expand by conquering a weaker state. It is like saying that no pike may swallow a minnow. I suggest, therefore, we let Iraq keep Kuwait and so avoid starting a war. It should be remembered that many boundaries were lines drawn on the map by the colonial powers decades ago. Sometimes a line splits a nation in half. It would be a mistake to defend every frontier in the world.

It is alleged that Saddam is a horrible man. However, most states in Africa and Asia are ruled by despots. It is beyond our power to attack all of them and oust their rulers. Why pick on Saddam alone? Would a new government be any better? President Bush stated that the Americans are trying to destabilise Iraq in order to remove Saddam. This could be counter-productive. Many people in this country want to be rid of Mrs Thatcher, but they would resent it if this were accomplished by foreign agents.

Armchair warriors tell us that our air-power will soon defeat the Arabs. Will it? The Russians, with a modern air force, attacked and bombed the Afghans for years. In the end, the Russians were worn down by guerilla warfare and retreated. The Muslims think they are the only true faith and that the Christians are infidels. They will sink their differences and unite in a Holy War against the "colonialists" and "infidels".

Another argument is that we must attack soon before Saddam adds nuclear weapons to his arsenal of nerve gas. The Israelis have held three hundred nuclear bombs and nerve gas for ten years, but nobody in

the Christian countries has complained. In fact, I suspect this is the real reason for the crisis. The Zionist lobby has great influence in the U.S.A. and it is said that America is Israel's largest colony. The Zionists in America want Saddam defeated before he acquires nuclear weapons. Once he has them, the Israelis will have to think twice about using theirs on him, for fear of reprisals.

The danger is that war could develop into one between America and Israel against all the Muslims. When the Americans suffer casualties, they will put pressure on the Europeans to send more troops. Since the war will be long (it will not be "over by Christmas"), that could lead to conscription. Most of your constituents would resent their sons having to fight in a war where no British interest is at stake.

If the Americans build up a large force in Arabia, but do not attack, they will have problems. The troops will be bored and lonely and will be without women, alcohol and air-conditioning in a hot climate. Eventually, there will be a mutiny. An alternative is to attack, but who can tell the eventual consequences? The third option would be to withdraw the army back to the U.S.A., but that would result in loss of face.

A Life Of Ease

We should consider what the people are like whom we are trying to save. Kuwait is about the richest country per capita in the world. They have almost no taxes. Their revenue comes mostly from oil. It is incongruous that highly-taxed Americans and Europeans should have to bear extra taxation to save people who lived tax-free. Six in ten of the inhabitants of Kuwait were foreign workers. The Kuwaitis themselves do no work. The administration was done by experts hired from all over the world. The menial work was done by poor people, often from India or the Phillipines. They are supposed to be excused from manual labour when the temperature exceeds 50 degrees Centigrade. However, the Kuwaiti government never admits that 50 degrees has been exceeded. Foreign labourers were to be seen repairing roads and toiling on building sites at a temperature of 55 degrees.

Many Kuwaiti families employ six maids. The women are spoilt and the men are arrogant. The employers retain the passports of their foreign servants so that they cannot escape, make them work up to fifteen hours a day and pay them a pittance. They are almost slaves. No Phillipina will work for a Kuwaiti if she can find employment with a European or an American. American women married to Kuwaitis are treated as the lowest of the low. Some Kuwaitis marry a Christian woman in order to avoid the bride-price they would have to pay for an Arab woman.

We are told we must secure our oil supplies, but oil is found in many other parts of the world. To fight the Arabs would be very expensive. If the same amount of money were spent on developing new oilfields elsewhere, the oil from Iraq and Kuwait could be replaced. Ultimately, of course, the world's oil will be no more. We shall have to find other forms of energy, and since we will have to do it eventually, we ought to start now. That would enable us to become independent of the oil in Muslim countries. The rest of the world could then ignore them and live in peace.

ANOTHER VIEW ON TAXATION

by RICHARD MOLESWORTH

UNDER the sub-heading "Won't Pay, Can't Vote!", in his article "Beyond The Poll Tax" in last month's **Candour**, Noel Hunt says: "One has no objection to an income tax per se. What is evil is that it is graduated. In effect the prudent and the competent are taxed to support the feckless and incompetent."

This is not quite a balanced statement in its apparent assumption that wealth is always accrued in exact proportion to a person's usefulness to society. It is all too obvious that money is often obtained by dishonest or criminal means, and the system of taxation proposed would amply reward those who became rich in that way. In a society where direct taxation ("income tax" is surely a misnomer if it bears no relation to how much a person earns) is equal for all, there would certainly be an incentive to acquire money - but not necessarily by legal or beneficial endeavour.

According to Mr Hunt's assessment there is only one cause for having a low income or none at all, and that is fecklessness or incompetence, and therefore it should be penalised. But there are cases where even those members of society who are potentially the most valuable to it are normally - and rightly - in a low income group. That is when they are at the start of their working life, while if they happen to be students they may have no income at all other than what, in any case, is provided by the state, or their parents.

If the total amount of revenue to be raised by direct taxation were to remain the same as now, I suspect that the system proposed would impose an impossible burden on everyone at this early stage in their lives, and that they would find it virtually impossible to save anything for future purchases.

Furthermore, the system is supposed to punish the feckless and incompetent, but if through either, or for any other reason, a person's income was less than the tax he was required to pay, he would be the very person to escape paying his share. The money simply could not be extracted from him, so in effect the sliding scale would still be in force.

SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

A POLICEMAN in Northern Ireland was kidnapped and murdered; an Army sergeant in London seriously wounded; an assassination attempt on our former Governor of Gibraltar. The usual procedure was followed. We saw pictures of policemen crawling about looking for clues, we heard the customary lamentations and tut-tutting from our masters. Then the victims were forgotten within a week. Imagine the uproar had an I.R.A. terrorist been shot and killed. The demands for a judicial enquiry as to why he hadn't been arrested; the suggestions that the dead man was really innocent; complaints that the Army has adopted a "shoot to kill" policy (as though the I.R.A. has ever done anything else); even moans from the Irish Government about the legality of the shooting.

OUR FLAT EARTH

THOSE who opposed fluoridation from the outset did so, not because they believed that harmful effects might outweigh any beneficial effects, but because they realised that fluoridation of the public water supply was intended to establish a dangerous precedent in English law - namely, the right of a public authority to dose people without their consent, against their objections and in spite of their declared fears. In European countries subject to the Napoleonic Code, fluoridation, whilst undoubtedly an infringement of personal rights, does not create a precedent in Law. English Law, however, is Common Law, and it works upon precedent.

Those who based their opposition on this fact, rather than upon medical and scientific arguments, not accessible to the sound judgement of the layman, are now proven abundantly right. In a letter to **The Times** Sir Graham Hills, Principal and Vice Chancellor of Strathclyde University, calls for contraceptives to be added to food supplies. He wrote, "Up until now we have lacked an acceptable way of discouraging or preventing casual child-bearing. I believe it would not be an infringement of liberty or a denial of any religious principle to insist that a child be at least desired. If, for example, contraceptive material were introduced into the human food chain, then all casual sexual encounters would be unproductive." If he believes that, he can believe anything!

[With acknowledgement to **Liverpool Newsletter**, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH. Annual Subscription: £2.]

SOUTHWARK Borough Council will not change the name of their Housing Works Office (Winnie Mandela House) even if she is convicted of kidnapping and assault. How about changing the name to the Stompie Moekestsi Memorial Hall? Or would that be indelicate?

SEEN on an Edinburgh wall: "If voting changed anything, 'they' would ban it." Obviously food for thought next polling day.

AVAILABLE FROM CANDOUR TAPES

HIDDEN ASPECTS OF THE KATYN MASSACRE, Louis Fitzgibbon (C90) £4
NATIONAL FRONT AT ROTHERHAM, June 1976 election rally (C60) £3
REVILO P. OLIVER SPEAKS, 1968 lecture in Buffalo, U.S.A. (C90) £4
RHODESIAN INDEPENDENCE, Broadcasts and songs (C60) £3
FR. CHARLES COUGHLIN ON THE AIR, April 1937 (C60) £3

Please address orders to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

Read **SPEARHEAD** - Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 80p from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £6.00 OVERSEAS £9.00 AIRMAIL U.S. \$20 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD. [Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle]